DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 262 477 EA 018 029

AUTHOR Kees, Patricia W.
TITLE Meritorious Schools: Mandates and Models.
PUB DATE Apr 85
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 31-April 4, 1985). Appendix C (pp. 20-24) removed because of illegibility. Other appendices contain small, broken type.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Assessment; Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; *Incentive Grants; Models; Predictor Variables; *School Effectiveness; State Legislation; State School District Relationship
IDENTIFIERS District Quality Instruction Incentives Program; Florida; *Meritorious School Act (Florida)

ABSTRACT

Florida's Meritorious School Act provides monetary rewards for meritorious schools in each of the state's 67 districts when the schools are identified using approved procedures. The law calls for each district to develop its own plan for selecting winning schools. Each school must be selected in part by being in the upper quartile of district schools in terms of relative or expected rate of student gain as measured by standardized verbal and quatitative achievement tests, as well as according to standards associated with at least one of four other categories of effective school criteria. This report describes the standards applied, the problems districts faced in using the models for equitable selection proposed by the state department of education in the program's first year, reasons for nonparticipation in the program by 36 districts, and the characteristics of the plans used by the districts. Appendixes present participation data and selection criteria associated with each district. (PGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED262477

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Patricia W. Kees

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

MERITORIOUS SCHOOLS: MANDATES AND MODELS

Patricia W. Kees
Director, Research and Evaluation
Duval County Public Schools

Presented at
The American Educational Research Association's Annual Meeting
Chicago, Illinois

April, 1985

EA 018 029

MERITORIOUS SCHOOLS: MANDATES AND MODELS

The importance of the effective schools movement and research lies in its applicability and utilization in educational settings. Responses to the scholarly works of Cohen, Coleman, Jencks, Murphy, Mackenzie, and a host of others in the field have been many and varied. A small response may be made by a single principal in utilizing the research to address goal setting in his school or by a classroom teacher changing the system for rewards in academic achievement. More global responses can be seen at the state or national level.

In the state of Florida, the belief that one can delineate and measure the variables of school success and effectiveness is the underlying premise of the Accountability Act of 1976. The presumption is made that there are certain variables which are necessary to the providing of a quality education. These variables traditionally have been drawn from the effective schools research. In June, 1984, the State of Florida made a stronger move toward the measurement of selected variables and the use of their data to determine effective schools by passage of the Meritorious School Act.

Monetary rewards were provided for the meritorious schools in each district. Districts had the option to submit a ratified plan by October 1, 1984. These plans were to specify the variables used in determining the meritorious schools (upper quartile) in the respective district. An examination of a sample of plans approved by the Florida State Department of Education revealed that districts often identified variables used in effective schools literature, such as achievement, academic rewards, etc.

The following chart represents Mackenzie's (1983) compilation of much of the research. Only the core elements or criteria are cited in this paper.

DIMENSIONS OF EFFECTIVE SCHOOLING[1]

Leadership Dimensions

Core Elements

- Positive Climate and Overall Atmosphere
- Goal-Focused Activities Toward Clear, Attainable and Relevant Objectives
- Teacher-Directed Classroom Management and Decisionmaking
- In-Service Staff Training for Effective Teaching

Efficacy Dimensions

Core Elements

- High and Positive Achievement Expectations With a Constant Press for Excellence
- Visible Rewards for Academic Excellence and Growth
- Cooperative Activity and Group Interaction in the Classroom
- Total Staff Involvement With School Improvement
- Autonomy and Flexibility to Implement Adaptive Practices
- Appropriate Levels of Difficulty for Learning Tasks

Efficiency Dimensions

Core Elements

- Effective Use of Instructional Time; Amount and Intensity of Engagement in School Learning
- Orderly and Disciplined School and Classroom Environments
- Continuous Diagnosis, Evaluation, and Feedback
- Well-Structured Classroom Activities
- Instruction Guided by Content Coverage
- Schoolwide Emphasis on Basic and Higher Order Skills

Facilitating Elements Not Noted

---

[1]Chart adapted from: "Research for School Improvement: An Appraisal of Some Recent Trends." Donald E. Mackenzie Educational Researcher, April, 1983

An examination of these core elements of effective schools reveals several which would be difficult to quantify, such as positive climate or flexibility. However, other criteria are more readily measured, i.e., clearly stated objectives or quantity and quality of inservice staff training. The Florida Statute for Meritorious Schools (231.532) included several "effective school" criteria, the most dominant being achievement data.

The selection for Meritorious Schools required that they must be selected, in part, by being at least in the upper quartile of schools in terms of relative or expected rate of student gain (or a combination) as measured by standardized tests of verbal and quantitative achievement.

The selection process must also include one or more of the following categories:

a. Standardized tests (other than required component) -- examples given in the Act are national physical fitness test or the State Student Assessment Tests.

b. Participation standards -- examples given in the Act are membership in formal school support organizations or student participation in science fairs.

c. Achievement standards -- examples given in the Act are vocational placements or winners of district, regional, or state competitions.

d. Discipline standards -- examples given in the Act are suspension rates or attendance rates.

The District Quality Instruction Incentives Program (Meritorious School Plan) was optional for each of Florida's 67 districts. The program had two goals and several general requirements. The two goals are:

1. To increase the performance of public school students.

2. To provide economic incentives to instructional and other approved personnel.

The general requirements for a district plan to qualify are:

1. Program must be designed to meet the two stated goals.
2. Must be free from racial or other prohibited discrimination.
3. Must provide for voluntary participation by eligible personnel.
4. Must be of no more than one year in duration.
5. Must be submitted to the Department before October 1 each year.
6. At least half of the funds granted must be awarded in the category of meritorious schools.
7. Awards may be made only to personnel who return to employment with a school district for the year following or to those who retire.
8. All awards to be made by the district in October in the year following.
9. Must provide for the prescribed distribution of all the funds allocated to the district for the program.
10. Must be bargained and ratified per Chapter 447, F.S., prior to official submission to the Department.
11. Must meet all other requirements of Section 231.532, F.S.
12. Must include provisions for recognizing student progress at meritorious schools.

Florida's foremost requirement, that of improved academic achievement, correlates with perhaps the single most constant element in effective schools research - "high achievement expectations." The achievement criterion must be addressed by all district plans and meritorious schools "must be selected by being at least in the upper quartile."

After a school has been determined to have met "the upper quartile requirement", it must be deemed meritorious in at least one of a choice of four other standards to qualify as a "merit school."

The standard allowing for school selection based on the "Other Standardized Testing" component permits schools to include additional tests

such as Florida's Statewide Student Assessment Test or the national physical fitness test to give an added dimension to their plan.

The Participation Standards of Florida's plan allow for great flexibility. Districts are allowed to consider student participation in a variety of activities from Honor Societies to Math and Science fairs as evidence of quality schools. Certainly this reflects the effective schools variables of "visible rewards" for academic excellence, positive learning climate and other criteria specifically embedded in curriculum-related activities.

Achievement Awards Standards in the plan connect many variables cited in research concerned with student/community involvement, positive academic achievement/expectations, well-structured learning activities, and competitive systems coupled with appropriate reward mechanisms.

The Discipline Standard speaks directly to the concept of "orderly and disciplined school and classroom environments."

These standards from the Florida plan speak rather specifically to particular elements of the dimensions of effective schooling. It is clearly not enough, however, to feel that a single standard matches a particular element. Student achievement, for example, is always reflective of a multi-layered organization in which component parts are learning climate, leadership, teacher development, curriculum standards, cooperative activity toward relevant objectives, parental support, etc. So that, upon review, the Florida Act apparently allowed for inclusion by local districts of many of the factors cited in "effective school's literature." If one determines that sufficient allowance was made for inclusion of many variables, the supposition would be that all districts would apply for the incentive rewards for their local systems. Only

31 of the 67 districts in Florida submitted a plan to the Department of Education. There were a variety of reasons cited for non-submittal of plans.

Several districts analyzed their achievement data using the models proposed by the State Department of Education and found flaws in each model. Districts were faced with finding a statistical analysis model for placing schools in the upper quartile which would be equitable to all schools within that district. Many measurement staffs suggested that there were too many confounding variables within a school setting to ever equitably achieve unbiased and accurate selection of schools for the upper quartile.

Some districts, such as Duval, could not get the teachers' bargaining unit (DTU) to ratify the plan - though the actual number of teachers voting, pro or con, represented only 4% of the teachers in the county. The state specified that a district's legal bargaining unit must ratify the plan in each district. The state also gave no indication that less than complete school selection plans, ready for implementation in the 1984-85 year, would be approved and the three month timeline (July 1 - October 1) was prohibitive. Therefore, only 31 school districts submitted a ratified plan by the October 1 deadline. All of these plans were later approved by the State Department of Education. An examination of the 31 districts' quality incentive plans (Appendix A, p. 10) reveals that in all of the districts, 100% of their schools would participate.

The districts had the option of allocating 50% of their local funds to the Meritorious School Plan and 50% to their local Merit Teacher Plan (not to replace Florida's Statewide Merit Teacher Plan).

Of these, 13 districts earmarked 100% of the funds to be allocated to the Meritorious Schools Program. Of the remainder, 14 of those districts surpassed the state required allocation of 50% of funding for the Meritorious Schools section of the program. Of the 31 district plans, 26 allocated all funding to personnel, 2 allocated to both personnel and school equipment, and 3 allocated all funds to school equipment or supplies.

Each district was required to use an "upper quartile model" or a "too few schools model" for their primary (initial) selection of schools. Only 11 districts submitted plans using as their primary method of analysis a model to delineate schools falling within the "upper quartile." Twenty districts submitted plans using a "too few schools model", deemed appropriate for smaller counties. Districts must also include selection data involving at least one additional standard.

Standards utilizing data from additional standardized testing were included in 12 of the models. Student/parent participation standards were included in 24 of the models. Achievement awards standards appeared in 8 models, and discipline standards were included in 18 of the 31 district plans. Seven districts listed additional standards not delineated by the state.

To evaluate achievement of a specified standard, each district had to establish baseline data for which specified improvement would be documented.

A review of the 31 plans reveals many similar patterns. Six specific plans were selected for this paper. One of the selected plans was shared by six school districts, so this selection represents, in reality, 12 counties and a sample of the basic plans submitted to

the state (Appendix B, p. 13).

Four counties (Broward, Dade, Indian River, and Pinellas) submitted upper quartile models. Wakulla submitted a "too few schools model" and Sarasota submitted a "developmental model." Two districts are using a regression model to determine "upper quartile." The majority utilize an expected or relative gain model. Districts using a regression model admit problems with confounding variables and their plans indicate further statistical work in this area.

Of these six plans, two districts indicate use of funds will be for instructional personnel only; three will use funds for all school-based personnel; and one (Pinellas) will use funds for materials and supplies. Of these six plans, only Dade "categorizes" or "ranks" meritorious schools in allocating funds.

In the final consideration of these plans, it is important to note that either implicitly or explicitly educators are now able to identify effective schools variables. Therefore, the issues now surrounding meritorious school models appear to fall into two categories - those dealing with unbiased, accurate measurement concerns and those dealing with the legal ramifications.

APPENDICES

Summary Data Based Upon District Quality Instruction Incentives Program Plans Approved In 1984

Attached is a summary of selected data relative to the thirty-one (31) District Quality Instruction Incentives Program Plans that have been approved for the 1984-85 school year. The headings included on the form are based upon requirements and options included in the law.

Below is a description of the information included on the report by column number.

Column (1) - The percentage of schools participating in the program is given. In those cases where no percentage is indicated this information is not discernable through a review of the plan because of local options built into the plan.

Column (2) - This is the percentage of each district's allocation that has been designated for awards for meritorious school recognition.

Column (3) - This indicates how the awards that are to be provided for meritorious school recognition will be allocated. The letter "P" indicates that awards will go to personnel and an "S" indicates that the award will go to the meritorious school(s) for the purchase of materials, supplies and/or equipment.

Column (4) - The letter "P" in this column indicates that a portion of the districts allocation will go for individual personnel awards based upon criteria other than employment in a meritorious school. The letter "D" in this column indicates that the district is going to provide funds (in addition to its state allocation for this program) for personnel awards.

Columns (5) and (6) - An "X" in column 5 indicates that meritorious schools will be those identified as the upper quartile schools. An "X" in column 6 indicates that meritorious school determination will be based on improved performance as allowed in districts with too few schools to determine an upper quartile.

Columns (7) through (11) - The "X" in one or more of these columns indicates the standard(s) of performance (in addition to tests of quantitative and verbal achievement) that will be used to determine meritorious schools.

Columns (12) through (14) - An "X" in one of these columns indicates the primary method used to determine standards for improvement.

Columns (15) through (27) - An "X" in any one of these columns indicates the criteria used to determine individual teacher awards other than those that are meritorious school related.

Information obtained from: State of Florida, Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida

DISTRICT QUALITY INSTRUCTION INCENTIVES PROGRAM SUMMARY

SELECTION OF MERITORIOUS SCHOOLS

	Participation	Funding			Improved Performance Plan Basis		Other Standards of Performance					Methods used to Determine Standard		
DISTRICT	Percentage of Schools Participating (1)	% of Allocation for Meritorious Schools (2)	School Awards P/S* (3)	Other Awards P/S/D* (4)	Upper Quartile (5)	Too Few Schools Model (6)	Standardized Tests (7)	Participation Standards (8)	Achievement Awards (9)	Discipline Standards (10)	Other (11)	Indicators of Progress (12)	School Goals (13)	Other (14)
BAKER	100%	50+	P	P		X		X		X			X	
BREVARD	100%	50+	P	P	X		X	X					X	
BROWARD	100%	50+	P	P	X			X					X	
CALHOUN	100%	100	P			X	X			X			X	
COLUMBIA	100%	50+	P	P		X		X	X	X			X	
DADE		50	P	P	X		X			X			X	
DE SOTO	100%	100	P			X	X	X	X	X			X	
DIXIE	100%	100	P			X		X					X	
GULF	100%	100	S			X		X					X	
HAMILTON		50+	P	P		X		X					X	
HARDEE		100	P			X		X					X	
HIGHLANDS		100	P			X				X			X	
INDIAN RIVER	100%	50	P	P	X		X	X			X		X	
JACKSON	100%	50	S-P	P		X		X					X	
LAFAYETTE	100%	50+	P	P		X				X			X	
LAKE	100%	50+	P	P	X					X			X	
LEVY	100%	50+	P	P		X		X	X	X	X		X	
MADISON	100%	50+	P	P		X	X	X					X	
MANATEE	100%	50+	P	P	X		X	X	X	X			X	
MARTIN	100%	50+	P	P		X	X	X	X	X			X	
MONROE		100	P	D	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	
NASSAU		100	S-P			X		X			X		X	
PASCO	100%	50+	P	P	X		X	X		X			X	
PINELLAS	100%	50	S	S	X			X		X	X		X	
PUTNAM		100	P		X					X			X	
ST. LUCIE		100	P			X		X					X	
SARASOTA	100%	50+	P	P	X			X					X	
SUWANNEE	100%	50+	P	P		X	X	X	X				X	
UNION		100	P			X		X		X	X		X	
WAKULLA		100	P			X	X	X	X	X	X		X	
WASHINGTON		100	S			X		X					X	
Total					11	20	12	24	8	18	7		31	

*P=Personnel Award; S=School Equipment Material or Supplies Award; D=District Money for Personnel Awards

DISTRICT	BASIS FOR DETERMINING MERIT PAY FOR INDIVIDUAL PERSONNEL PERFORMANCE OTHER THAN EMPLOYMENT AT MERITORIOUS SCHOOL												
	Critical Teacher Shortage												
	School Site (15)	Subject Area(s) (16)	Teachers in Special Schools (17)	Infield Credit (18)	Superior Evaluation by Principal (19)	Outstanding Attendance (20)	Mathematics Personnel Extended School Year (21)	Mathematics Personnel Extended School Day (22)	Science Personnel Extended School Year (23)	Science Personnel Extended School Day (24)	Computer Education Personnel Extended School Year (25)	Computer Education Personnel Extended School Day (26)	Other (27)
BAKER				X		X							X Prof. Org. Non-Supp. Act
BREVARD		X		X									X
BROWARD													
CALHOUN													
COLUMBIA				X									X
DADE	X			X									X Graduate Program
DE SOTO													
DIXIE													
GULF													
HAMILTON				X		X							
HARDEE													
HIGHLANDS													
INDIAN RIVER													X District Career Ladder
JACKSON				X		X							X In-service Act.
LAFAYETTE				X		X							
LAKE						X							X Tuition Payment
LEVY				X		X							
MADISON				X		X							
MANATEE				X	X	X							
MARTIN				X		X							
MONROE													
NASSAU													
PASCO						X							
PINELLAS													X Schools of Distinction
PUTNAM													
ST. LUCIE													
SARASOTA				X		X							
SUWANNEE				X		X							X Tuition Payment
UNION													
WAKULLA													
WASHINGTON													
TOTAL 15	1	1		12	1	11							16

FLORIDA MERITORIOUS SCHOOL PLANS
SELECTED DISTRICTS

District	Selection Criteria	Testing Procedure	Use of Funds
Broward ($1,663,437)	Stage 1 Schools must be in the upper quartile in terms of relative or expected rate of student gain as measured on a standardized test. Stage 2 Schools must attain improvement in the percentage of student participation in at least one of the following areas of academic competition: computer, mathematics, science, social studies, academic games, and language arts competition. A committee of Technical and Statistical Oversight (CTSO) will determine level of improvement required.	California Achievement Test (CAT) grades 1 - 9 Sequential Test of Educational Progress (STEP) grades 10,11 ANCOVA statistical procedures will be applied to data. CAT achievement test scores in reading, language, and math from the previous year will be used as independent variables. CAT scores for current year will serve as dependent variables. At secondary level, previous years of CAT scores will serve as independent variables and STEP verbal and quantitative scores will serve as independent variables. Other independent variables will be the following: age in days (extreme ages excluded), race - sex, e.g., the proportion of boys and girls who are Black, White, Oriental, Hispanic and Indian, school as a categorical variable. The Committee of Technical and Statistical Oversight (CTSO) will refine and improve the statistical model.	Payment shall be based on the following formula: Instructional bargaining unit members x $1,000. Each school electing to participate must develop a distribution plan no later than May 1, 1985, for approval.
Dade ($3,024,840)	Sixty Quality Schools (Q), $500 Share (1) achieving the upper quartile of participating district schools at comparable grade level groups (i.e., elementary, middle/junior high, senior high) as measured by student gain in verbal and quantitative achievement on the 1985 administration	Gain in verbal and quantitative achievement on the 1985 administration of the Stanford Achievement Test. Technical Review Panel: three members with recognized expertise in testing and statistical research procedures. The panel will identify schools in the	All school-site personnel in Quality schools will receive a $500 share, personnel in Excellence schools will receive a $750 share; personnel in Educational Excellence schools will receive a $1,500 share. Eligible employees are school-site employees who are 1. members of UTD bargaining unit

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

District	Selection Criteria	Testing Procedure	Use of Funds
Dade (continued)	of the Stanford Achievement Test, and (2) achieving at least an 80% participation of eligible students or maintaining the 1983-84 rate, whichever is greater, on a standardized physical fitness test during the 1984-85 school year. Thirty Excellence Schools (E), $750 Share (1) Elementary level -- Improvement in student attendance over 1983-84 for the plan year. (2) Middle/Junior High School level -- Improvement in student attendance over 1983-84, or improvement in subject area tests, when appropriate tests in multiple and diverse academic subject areas are available and baseline district data are established. (3) Senior High School level -- Improvement in student attendance and dropout rate over 1983-84, or improvement in subject area tests, when appropriate tests in multiple and diverse academic subject areas are available and baseline district data are established. Ten Educational Excellence Schools (E), $1,500 Share. Said selection shall be based on attainment of a school student achievement standard selected by each faculty, which shall consist of school-site certificated personnel. For the	upper quartile on the residual (actual-minus-expected) 1985 SAT results. Panel responsible for identifying explicit variables and statistical procedures by conducting trial analyses using 1982-83 and 1983-84 data. Through the trial analyses, statistical and measurement issues will be resolved, e.g., to remove influence of SES and grade configuration factors.	2. members of UDPD/UTD bargaining 3. administrators 4. full-time maintenance, custodial, and cafeteria personnel 5. other personnel, as agreed by the parties. To receive payment, full-time employee would have to be on payroll at least eight of the ten school months during the 1984-85 school year. Those employed for less than eight months would be eligible for a prorate share. Those who transfer within district, retire, or who are on approved leave remain eligible for payment.

BEST COPY AVAILAB

District	Selection Criteria	Testing Procedure	Use of Funds
Dade (continued)	purpose of this section, each faculty shall identify one standard related to student achievement		
Indian River ($117,826)	Stage 1 Schools must be in the upper quartile of the district's schools based on the relative rate of student gain as measured on standardized tests of verbal and quantitative achievement. Stage 2 Schools achieving Stage 1 must accomplish one of the following standards: 1. Elementary schools must achieve at least one of the following standards to be designated a meritorious school: (a) The School Volunteer Program will qualify for the Governor's Golden School Award. (b) The School Advisory Committee will meet at least five times during the year. (c) The school will publish an anthology with original writing from at least five percent of the students enrolled in the school. 2. Middle/Junior High Schools must achieve at least one of the following standards to be designated a meritorious school: (a) The School Volunteer Program will qualify for the Governor's	Grades 1 - 11 SRA Achievement Test (grades 1-9) Scholastic Aptitude Test (grades 10 & 11) Brigance Inventory (exceptional students) SRA: Aggregate gain scores based on publisher's standard score scale will be calculated for each grade. For each grade, the school's mean gain score will be converted to a z score for comparison purposes. Top three elementary schools will be selected from rankings, the top middle or junior high school will be selected. SAT: Selection will be based on number of students scoring above 450 on the verbal or mathematics sections. An expected number will be projected based on scores from previous three years. To achieve the SAT criteria, the number of students scoring above 450 must exceed the expected number by 10%. In addition, the percentage of students taking the SAT must be within the percentage range for the previous seven years. Brigance Of the exceptional students recommended for testing, 80% will achieve an average one-half year's progress on selected items.	Payment will be made only to personnel within schools selected as meritorious who are members of the IRCEA bargaining unit.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

District	Selection Criteria	Testing Procedure	Use of Funds
Indian River (continued)	Golden School Award. (b) The school will publish an anthology including original writing from at least five percent of the students enrolled in the school. (c) There will be a five percent increase in the number of books checked out of the school library by students. 3. The high school must achieve at least one of the following standards to be designated a meritorious school: (a) There will be a six percentage point increase in the number of students achieving all of the State Minimum Student Performance Standards on the SSAT-I in grade 10. (b) The school will publish an anthology including original writing from at least 75 students enrolled in this school. (c) For the 1984-85 school year, the number of dropouts will decrease by 10 percent over the 1983-84 school year. 4. The Wahesso School for Exceptional Students must achieve the following standard to be designated a meritorious school: Eighty percent (80%) of the Trainable Mentally Handicapped (TMH) students must master the State Minimum Student Performance Standards in Basic Pre-Vocational skills at the appropriate level.		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

District	Selection Criteria	Testing Procedure	Use of Funds
Pinellas ($1,118,630)	Stage 1 Upper quartile on ability and achievement tests. Stage 2 School selects and attains one of the following goals: (a) increase percent of student attendance from previous year by one-half of one percent. (b) increase the percent of students taking the national physical fitness test by one-half of the maximum amount of improvement possible.	Students in grades 3, 5, 6, 8, 11 CTBS (Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills) TCS (Test of Cognitive Skills) April, 1985 Anticipated composite reading and mathematics scores will be calculated for each student. Anticipated mean composite scores will be calculated for each school and grade level. Anticipated composite scores will be calculated using univariate regression equations developed by CTB/ McGraw-Hill. Schools will be ranked by percent of students exceeding school's anticipated mean. Range of percent exceeding mean anticipated score will be calculated as follows: range = (high percent-low percent)+1 Range will be divided by four and that figure subtracted from the highest percent to determine cut off for upper quartile. An 80% confidence limit will be applied to ensure plan is fair and unbiased. - - - -

District	Selection Criteria	Testing Procedure	Use of Funds
Sarasota ($316,752)	Developmental Model for Merit School Selection Sarasota County Meritorious School Evaluation Committee 3 Teachers - K-5, 6-8, 9-12 3 Non-Instructional - K-5, 6-8, 9-12 3 Principals - K-5, 6-8, 9-12 3 District - K-5, 6-8, 9-12 3 SAC - K-5, 6-8, 9-12 Criteria for School Selection: A. Standardized test scores and achievement B. One or more of the following: 1. Student attendance 2. Team Management Advisory Council 3. Student discipline 4. Student achievements: e.g., vocational competition, science fairs, etc. 5. Extracurricular activities 6. School volunteer program 7. Professional improvement 8. Public relations 9. Physical fitness 10. Other Amended 12/18/84 as follows: B. An alternative goal for each of the participating schools shall be the expansion of the existing School Volunteer Program.	Students in grades 2, 5, 8, 11 American Testronics Comprehensive Assessment Program: Cognitive Abilities Test and Total Reading and Total Mathematics for the Achievement Series Expected scores will be calculated for each student, with a built-in 80% confidence interval. Schools will be ranked on basis of percent of students who are achieving above expectancy on each of the two achievement batteries: Total Reading and Total Mathematics. A school may qualify for either a half or full share.	Personnel eligible to receive an award shall include the building principal and all other personnel assigned to the school (instructional and non-instructional). Payments will be made in October, 1985, to all personnel who meet the criteria and who return to employment in a Florida school district, who are on official leave, or who retire.

-10-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

District	Selection Criteria	Testing Procedure	Use of Funds
Wakulla ($30,578) "Too Few Schools" Model	1. Minimum 57 points on standardized testing criteria 2. Schools will select objectives related to student participation, student achievement, and parental and community involvement from a list of objectives developed by the district. The majority of teachers at the school must approve the plan prior to submission for approval by the Superintendent or designee. Schools must achieve 100 points (verified by district) to be deemed meritorious.	California Achievement Tests, Grades K-11 Points will be awarded for achieving testing objectives as follows: a. Achievement at each grade level, in each skill area and total battery of .5 standard deviation above the mean, or an increase of .2 standard deviation above the average mean scaled score of the last three years. b. Achievement at each grade level on each subtest within the areas of language, reading or math or listening for information, pre-readiness skills and mathematics (kindergarten) at which (1) the median grade equivalent is greater than or equal to the grade of students tested at the time, (2) 25% or more of the students scoring in the upper quartile, (3) 25% or less of the students scoring in the lower quartile. c. Achievement at each grade level in each skill area for maintaining or increasing the percentage of students in quartiles 3 and 4, over the average of the last three years, if the total is 50% or greater. d. Achievement at each grade level in each skill area if 60% or more of the students perform in quartiles 3 or 4. e. Achievement at each grade level in each skill area for maintaining or increasing the percentage of students in quartile 4, over the average of the last three years, if the total is 25% or greater. f. Achievement at each grade level in each skill area if 35% or more of the students perform in quartile 4.	Funds will be distributed in October, 1985, to personnel who return to the district for the 1985-86 school year or who retire.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Bibliography

Bell, T. H. America Can Do It. AMERICAN EDUCATION, December 1983.

Benbow, Carolyn and Flaxman, Erwin ERIC/CUE: Urban Education Research Information Research on Instructionally Effective Schooling: Part I. THE URBAN REVIEW, Volume 12, Number 4, 1980. Agathon Press, Inc.

Benbow, Carolyn and Flaxman, Erwin ERIC/CUE: Urban Education Research Information Research on Instructionally Effective Schooling: Part II. THE URBAN REVIEW, Volume 13, Number 1, 1981. Agathon Press, Inc.

Brannon, Donald R., Parrish, Bill, and Brannon, Horrace. Four Dimensions of Quality in Effective Schools: How Important For Principals? NASSP Bulletin, October 1983.

Clauset, Jr., Karl H. and Gaynor, Alan K. A Systems Perspective on Effective Schools. EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP, December 1982.

Cohen, Michael Effective Schools: What the Research Says. TODAY'S EDUCATION, Volume 70, Number 2, April-May 1981.

Cohen, Michael Effective Schools: Accumulating Research Findings. AMERICAN EDUCATION, January-February 1982.

Curran, Thomas J. Characteristics of the Effective School - A Starting Point for Self-Evaluation. NASSP Bulletin, October 1983.

Evans, Robert W. Ohio's Effective School Program. AMERICAN SECONDARY EDUCATION, Special Issue, 1983.

Evans, Robert W. One State's Approach: Ohio's Effective School Program. NASSP Bulletin, October 1983.

Farley, John R. Some Characteristics of Leaders of Effective Schools. AMERICAN SECONDARY EDUCATION, Spring 1983.

Finn, Jr., Chester E. Toward Strategic Independence: Nine Commandments for Enhancing School Effectiveness. PHI DELTA KAPPAN, Volume 65, Number 8, April 1984.

Firestone, William A., and Herriott, Robert E. Prescriptions for Effective Schools Don't Fit Secondary Schools. EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP, December 1982.

Goldberg, Zandra S., and Spartz, James L. The Use of Longitudinal Analysis to Identify More and Less Effective Schools. March 1978.

Hartzog, Ernest E. Instructionally Effective Schools for Poor Children. February 1982.

Houlihan, G. Thomas Using the Right Variables in Measuring School Effectiveness. NASSP Bulletin, October 1983.

Kean, Michael H. Issues in Identifying Effective Schools. Paper, June 1982.

Landsmann, Leanna A+ Schools - Portraits of Schools That Work. INSTRUCTOR, 1984.

MacKenzie, Donald E. Research for School Improvement: An Appraisal of Some Recent Trends. EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, April 1983.

McCormack-Larkin, Maureen, and Kritek, William J. Milwaukee's Project RISE. EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP, December 1982.

Purkey, Stewart C. and Smith, Marshall S. Too Soon to Cheer? Synthesis of Research on Effective Schools. EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP, December 1982.

Serow, Robert C. and Jackson, Henry L. Using Standardized Test Data To Measure School Effectiveness. NASSP Bulletin, October 1983.

Shoemaker, Joan and Fraser, Hugh W. What Principals Can Do: Some Implications From Studies of Effective Schooling. PHI DELTA KAPPAN, Volume 63, Number 3, November 1981.

Solorzano, Lucia What Makes Great Schools Great. U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT, August 27, 1984.

Thomas, M. Donald Variables of Educational Excellence. THE CLEARING HOUSE, Volume 54, Number 6, February 1981.

APPENDIX C

(pp20-24)

Removed--will
not reproduce